

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, the drawing was objected to because the description on page 6 of the specification did not conform to what is shown in Fig. 6 of the drawing. In response, the description on page 6 is herewith amended in order to conform to what is shown in the drawing, thus overcoming the objection.

Claims 1 and 3 were objected to because of the noted informalities as specified on page 3 of the outstanding Action. In response, claims 1 and 3 are herewith amended in the manner suggested in the Action, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims, as herewith amended, are now in proper form.

On the merits, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eichenlaub in view of Balogh, for the reasons of record. In response, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

More particularly, as herewith amended, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the light source and the array are arranged such that each modulator is significantly illuminated by only one of the narrow sources, and a string of modulators which are parallel to the spacing direction are illuminated by each narrow light source. It is respectfully submitted that the teachings of the two references, even if taken in combination, neither show nor suggest these limitations as now more precisely recited.

Thus, for example, the Eichenlaub reference specifically requires that there be at least one light line 3 for every pair of pixel columns 4 in the transmissive display (see col. 3, lines 37-39), while the abstract of the Balogh reference clearly states that the number of pixels illuminated by one light source is greater than the number of light sources illuminating one pixel, thus clearly teaching that each pixel is illuminated by a plurality of light sources, rather than one source as in the instant invention.

Thus, the two cited and applied references clearly teach two different configurations, both of which are distinguishable from the configuration as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawing has been overcome by amending the specification in a manner consistent with the drawing, and the objections to claims 1 and 3 have been overcome by amending the claims in the manner suggested in the Action. Accordingly, the

instant application is respectfully submitted to be in condition
for allowance, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,236

Attorney

(914) 333-9630